

**CIHM/ICMH
Microfiche
Series.**

**CIHM/ICMH
Collection de
microfiches.**



Canadian Institute for Historical Microreproductions / Institut canadien de microreproductions historiques

© 1983

L

AN

IMPORTANT LETTER

ON

RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT,

FROM

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL GOWAN,

M. P. P. FOR THE COUNTY OF LEEDS IN U. CANADA.

"The man who is not moved with what he reads,
"Who takes not fire, when e'er his country needs:
"Unworthy of the blessings of the brave,
"Is base in kind, and born to be a slave."

COWPER.

TORONTO:

PRINTED AT THE EXAMINER OFFICE.

1870.

LETTER.

"The question is an important one, and it is but fair, that it should be approached on all hands, in a spirit of candour, impartiality and truth."—*Montreal Gazette*, 20th July 1839.

I have taken the above motto, from one of the most ultra, if not the most able, antagonist of Responsible Government, on the continent of British North America.—I have selected it purposely to show, *first* that those who are its greatest enemies, admit its "importance?" and *secondly*, to prove, by the same authority, that its discussion should be conducted 'in a spirit of candour, impartiality, and truth'—in that spirit I now approach it; and while I fervently hope for its continuance through the discussion, I cannot withhold my anxious desire, that in the same spirit, the reader will accompany me through it. With this introduction, which the public of all parties, will admit is a brief one, I proceed at once to the consideration of the subject.

As many persons either do not know, or do not desire to know what is meant by responsible government, it is necessary to explain what is meant and intended by those terms; so that all may know what they really are discussing and that no room for doubt, or cavil may hereafter exist.

By responsible government then, I mean that the Lieutenant Governor should form his Executive Council, or Colonial Cabinet, of gentlemen having seats in the local Legislature; and in whose judgment ability, and discretion, a majority of the Representatives of the people would rely, so as to ensure to the Executive, upon all important questions of domestic government, the concurrence and support of the Legislature—the Governor not to be bound to take any particular set of men, but to be allowed a free choice; and an unlimited discretion, not only in the selection, but in the dismissal of his advisers also. This then, is what I call responsible government—it is the British Constitution, as administered in England, but denied to the Colonies, with this exception, that in England it is necessarily more enlarged, embracing the Imperial interests of the whole empire; while in a colony, it would

be necessarily more narrow and circumscribed, embracing domestic and local interests only.

Having now stated what Colonial responsibility means, I will proceed to consider the matter under the following heads.

First—Does the present irresponsible system benefit England?

Second—Does it benefit Canada?

Third—What were its effects in the old Colonies?

Fourth—Is Colonial responsibility consistent with the Constitution?

Fifth—Is Colonial responsibility, a British or an American custom?

Sixth—Are the people of Upper Canada, deserving the benefits of its introduction?

Seventh—What has been its origin and progress in the Colony?

Lastly—Some objections to it answered.

I am first to consider; does the present irresponsible system, benefit England?—To answer this question, it will not be necessary to use much argument: it has been already declared in a continued strain of language not to be misunderstood for the last twenty years: and by authorities not to be doubted; that instead of benefiting England, the present irresponsible system, has been a constant source of unhappiness to her statesmen, and a constant drain upon her resources—a sort of unfathomable whirlpool, into which the best intentions of her Ministers, and the millions of her gold continually enter, and from which, nothing but discontent and fresh demands are emitted. To establish this fact, I will only refer to a few authorities; but those shall be conclusive.

Admiral Coffin, upwards of fifteen years ago, declared in his place in the British House of Commons, that so great and extravagant, were our constant demands upon England that it would be much better for the nation if the tow rope was cut and the Colonies set a drift!

Mr. Warburton, in the course of a lengthy speech, delivered in the British House of Commons, in August 1834, stated that the Colonies cost the English

tion
thous
clesias
vy, an
missa
partm
clusive
Wheat
argued
to the
gociate
Upw
nions w
nell Ba
ry at w
his hig
her Ma
the best
a correc
The
Chancel
on open
House o
last, stat
EXPEN
defence
euding A
dred and
and that
ending in
hundred
pounds;
makes th
sand thr
extraordi
we add th
as stated
Parnell,
for the la
the Britis
nine mil
thousand
I migh
ject from
Hume, N
other Ra
their pri
with me,
such upo
as I am,
shown, t
that the
fruitful
already
Nor can
the least
Surrend
plainly

tion upwards of two millions five hundred thousand annually, including Canals, Ecclesiastical establishment, the Army, Navy, and Indian establishments, the Commissariat, Ordinance, and Engineer Departments, Public Works, &c. &c., exclusive of the Timber Monopoly, the Wheat, Corn, and other Monopolies, and argued at much length, that it would be to the advantage of Great Britain, to negotiate a peaceable separation.

Upwards of two years ago, similar opinions were expressed by Sir Henry Parnell Bart M. P. for Dundee, and Secretary at war; and it is to be presumed that his high rank and official standing in her Majesty's Government afforded him the best possible opportunities, of forming a correct judgment upon the subject.

The Right Hon. Thomas Spring Rice Chancellor of the Exchequer, in his speech on opening the 'Budget,' in the British House of Commons, on the 7th of July last, stated that the EXTRAORDINARY EXPENSES ALONE, for the military defence of the Canadas, for the two years ending April 1838, amounted to *nine hundred and forty seven thousand pounds*; and that the estimate for the present year, ending in April 1840, is *one million one hundred and one thousand, three hundred pounds*; which added to the former sum, makes *two millions and forty eight thousand three hundred pounds sterling*, for extraordinary expenses alone. And if we add this sum, to the *ordinary expenses*, as stated by Mr. Warburton, Sir Henry Parnell, and others, it will be found that for the last three years the Canadas cost the British nation, the enormous sum of *nine million five hundred and forty eight thousand three hundred pounds sterling*!!

I might quote much to illustrate this subject from the published speeches of Mr. Hume, Mr. Roebuck, Mr. O'Connell, and other Radicals, but as neither the men nor their principles have ever been authorities with me, so I decline to adduce them as such upon the present occasion: satisfied as I am, that sufficient has been already shown, to convince every reasonable mind that the present irresponsible system is the fruitful parent of increased taxation to the already over-taxed people of England.—Nor can we hope by its continuance for the least diminution in this outrageous and excessive expenditure—this fact we are plainly told by those who are its warmest

and ablest advocates: as for example, in the 'Report of the Select Committee of the House of Assembly, on the state of the Province,' drawn up by Mr. Henry Sherwood, Q. C. and adopted by the House, in the Session of 1837 and 8; the following passage occurs.—'The next suggestion to which your Committee beg to draw the attention of your Hon. House, is the necessity (now too plainly obvious) of keeping up a respectable military force within both Provinces.' And again, the same demand is reiterated for continued military occupation and expenditure, in the 'Report of the Select Committee of the House of Assembly,' drawn up by Mr. Hagerman, A. G. and adopted by the House, at the close of the last Session, (1839) as the following passage will prove. 'Your Committee feel called upon to impress upon your Hon. House the necessity—a painful one it certainly is—of assuring our gracious Queen, that while her loyal subjects in these provinces, acknowledge with the deepest gratitude the efficient protection extended to them, by the large military force that has been stationed in the country, they are bound to reiterate the opinion expressed in the Report of your Hon. House of the last Session; that the continuance of this protection is essential to their future peace and safety.'

Thus, then, I trust I have shown, that not only is the present irresponsible system deeply injurious to England; but that it is proposed by its advocates, to render that deep injury, a settled incubus upon the mother country. Under such circumstances the plain question will naturally strike the mind of every reflecting man, can the continuance of such a system, promote a lasting connexion with the Parent State; or can those who uphold it, be considered as favourable to that connexion? Should they not rather be viewed as its worst enemies, and as the Traitors to British Supremacy in the Colonies? Is it of any consequence to England whether Mr. Christopher Hagerman, or Mr. Robert Baldwin, is the Attorney-General of Upper Canada—whether Mr. Henry Sherwood, or Mr. George Boswell, is called upon to discharge the duties of Queen's Counsel—whether Mr. Cartwright, or his partner, Mr. Armstrong, fill a similar post—or whether the situations held by Mr. John Joseph, Judge

Sherwood, Judge Jones, or Sir Allan Macnab, were filled by gentlemen unconnected with what is popularly termed, the "Family Compact?" I use the names of these gentlemen, by way of illustration; and I again repeat that it can make no difference to England, which class of those persons, fill the public offices in Up. Canada, provided the duties of the offices are discharged with integrity and ability. What interest then, can England have, to resist the public wish; or to keep any set of men in office, in opposition to the public voice? And yet, the advocates of irresponsibility, wish to make it appear, that upon the perpetual continuance in office, of one particular set of men, depends the connexion with the Mother Country!—Surely the futility of such an assumption is obvious to every man. Even the *Hon.* John Neilson, Editor of the Quebec Gazette, one of the most able antagonists of responsible government, in an elaborate article, published on the 15th July, 1839, honestly admits, that "it can be of no import to England, who are the men who hold office in the province, provided they discharge the duties of their office. She spends more money in Upper Canada, than all the Civil List amounts to, and it can be no great satisfaction to the Queen's Secretary for the colonies, to be troubled with the quarrels of the colonies." To close this head of the discussion, I would merely ask;—Does Great Britain desire to maintain the connexion, or does she not? This is a cardinal question. If the answer is in the affirmative, then I ask, *in what way* does she desire to maintain it—with the consent of the people, or by the sword? If with the consent of the people, then the wishes of the people should be consulted, and persons enjoying their confidence should administer the government. Thus a reciprocity, between those governing and those governed would prevail and the mutual tie would be too strong and too elastic, either to require military force to defend it or to be snapped by every hurricane, that faction and unprincipled men might attempt to raise. It is not necessary to argue the other alternative; because it must be obvious, that it is neither the interest, nor the principle of Britons, to enforce their institutions with the sword, nor to trace the records of their benignant sway, in characters of blood.

Having thus shown, that the Irresponsible system does not benefit England; I now come to the consideration of the second head, namely does it benefit Canada?

To a resident of the province, it would be scarcely necessary to put this interrogatory; *one view* of the country would be sufficient to satisfy any observant mind.—Yet strangers might be led to believe that a country, where so many establishments are upheld, and in the support of which, England annually lavishes so many millions, would surely possess, at least a degree of temporary contentment, prosperity & wealth; but unfortunately the sad reality forces a contrary confession; instead of having peace and tranquillity *within* and receiving capital, enterprise and emigration from *without*, we have civil war and contention at home, while the miserable pittance of capital, emigration or enterprise received from abroad, we have neither the influence nor the means to keep with us when they come. Thus then we find, that this irresponsible system, instead of benefiting Canada; that it discourages the British population; that it inflames the Reformers; that it gives a handle to domestic radicals and foreign Sympathisers; that it satisfies none but the vile "Compact;" that it taxes England; impoverishes Canada, and benefits the U. States; into which country all our money ultimately finds its way, never to return. If any man of common observation, will only divest himself of prejudice, and look at the country from the Eastern to its Western extremity, he cannot fail to behold its fruits, which the irresponsible tree has produced. Independent of the deepest and bitterest party-strife and animosity he cannot open his eyes without viewing deserted mansions! uncultivated fields! neglected harbours! half finished or half closed canals! miserable roads! depreciated property! a stagnant trade! a crippled commerce! a selfish and illiberal banking system! bayonets for Canada! and taxes for England to send them here! a diminished revenue! and an increasing debt!—He can see nothing of a prosperous, healthy or a thriving nature—his eyes only rest upon what has been described by Sir Francis Head, as "a land of pestilence and famine"—"a girdled tree, whose drooping branches, mournfully display that its natural nourishment, has been ex-

liberately visit the ask; who you describe, which country? your client parent state would not could not confess, that our climate pure; our internal pled; and we spruce but that "Stood a tree

If it is our air or our intelligence our misdeeds of our responsibility described? called in it down. No! even rather less—every every arrested straggling spurious lop off to been too symmetrical new life which for and health peace a follow.

I trust Canada of the iron it can be at this have been ball, for the Impoverished or wheeled the part fare. A ing our in the as is there blinded who can main a

liberately cut off." Should a stranger visit the the Province, he would naturally ask ; what has caused all the misery which you describe ; all the train of attendant evils, which are but too manifest in your country ? Is your soil unproductive ? your climate cold and barren ? Is the parent stem unhealthy ? And what reply would we give to such questions ? We could not negative them : we should confess, that our soil is rich and fertile ; that our climate is wholesome ; our waters pure ; our mineral wealth abundant ; our internal water communications unexampled ; and that the parent stem from whence we sprung, is not only sound and healthy, but that it has

"Stood a thousand years, the battle and the breeze."

If it is nothing in our soil or climate ; our air or water ; our industry, enterprise, or intelligence ; what then can cause all our misery and unhappiness, but the working of our colonial constitution ; the irresponsible tree, which I have before described ? Shall then the Axe man be called in, and the fatal order given—"cut it down, why cumbereth it the ground" ? No ! every British manly feeling forbid it ! rather let every voice be loud in its favour—every heart fortified for its defence—every arm uplifted to ward off the meditated stroke. Let the axe fall on the spurious protuberance of irresponsibility : lop off the unnatural swelling, that has been too long permitted to destroy its symmetry & draw off its sap—infuse the new life blood into the old channels from which for a time it has been withdrawn ; and health within and beauty without ; peace at home and strength abroad, will follow.

I trust then, that I have shown, that Canada is not benefited by a continuance of the irresponsible system ; unless indeed it can be a benefit to us, to view ourselves at this moment ; and to consider that we have been for years, a sort of political *football*, for the two great parties into which the Imperial Parliament is divided, to *kick* or *wheel* at their pleasure, as it may suit the party purposes of their political warfare. And what hope have we of bettering our condition, whatever party may be in the ascendant at home ? Or what man is there, not stultified by ignorance, or blinded by the most criminal selfishness, who can desire that we should longer remain a *political play-toy* for Mr. Christo-

pher Hagerman, and a *laughing-stock* for the intelligent and civilized world ? The language may be termed strong, but is it not true ? and what true-hearted loyalist, or lover of his country can avoid it ; when he beholds "the most despised man in Upper Canada," as if in mockery of the public voice, not only continued in office, but reference made to him, and his advice and counsel generally asked ! Should further information be desired, as to the actual condition, to which irresponsible government has reduced Upper Canada ; I know no document, in which it is more truly and faithfully described, than in his Excellency Sir George Arthur's despatch to Lord Glenelg : and to that document, full of descriptive truth, I beg respectfully to refer.

I am to consider, *thirdly* ; what were its effects in the Old Colonies ?

To view the effects of the irresponsible system in the Old Colonies, and to see what it has brought about, one has only to turn to their library, and open the first history of those colonies and plantations upon which the hand is laid, and in almost every page, we trace the baneful effects of this anti-British and rebellious system. Indeed the annals of our parent country abundantly prove that the Anglo-saxon race, would not long suffer the government of an irresponsible power. France has very recently demonstrated the same imperishable truism, and even the United States, men of our own blood, & children of our own parents, have brought home the same fact, and deposited it at our very doors ! Nay, more, does not the past history and present condition of our colonial possessions on this continent, establish the same fact ? Do we not see Up. and Lower Canada ; Nova Scotia and Prince Edward's Island ; Newfoundland, and Cape Breton ; all "hungering and thirsting," for local responsibility ; and all declaring, in language not to be misunderstood that without it, they can hope for no peace, no prosperity ? Have we not beheld the same system, produce the same fruit in New Brunswick, until the administration of Sir John Harvey, when in an hour of threatened invasion and emergency the responsible system was conceded to that colony ; and since the concession, what people have been more united ; what Governor more popular ; or what province more truly British ? Why

then should we be debarred of the same privileges, enjoyed by us when by our native fire-sides, in old England; and by our fellow-colonists in the loyal and flourishing province of New Brunswick? All history, as well human as divine goes to prove that without *peace* there can be no *prosperity*, contentment, being the foundation of all prosperity. A family, a church, a society, or a nation, at war with itself, instead of enjoying prosperity, wastes its resources, enervates its strength and falls into rapid decay—"a house divided against itself cannot stand." Let us then have the benefits and blessings of peace, by local self-government and security, and suffer us no longer to be repining in *distrust* and *dissatisfaction*, lest those may lead to a bitterer and more hostile feeling than at present exists. It is worthy of remark, that those of the old colonies which had the freest constitutions, remained the most loyal. Those in which the Crown retained the most power in its own hands, were the first to rebel; while those that had extended to them, the principle of even a partial responsibility, remained firm in their duty and allegiance, and were only torn from the parent state, by the 'pressure from without;' and even many of them (Rhode Island for example) retain to this day, the Royal Charter, with slight modifications as their constitution. It has been well and truly said, by an able and distinguished writer in the St. Catharines Journal, that the present State of New-York, was once the *Colony* of New-York; so it was;—there too, the "Glorious Flag" of Great Britain unfortunately protected a once proud and local "compact:" there, for many years, did a patient and loyal people pray for a redress of grievances: long and earnestly did they remonstrate against the irresponsible powers assumed by the domestic "compact:" but unluckily their complaints were unattended to, and what was the result? Where British laws might have been administered with British justice; where British power might have protected millions of happy and loyal Britons, content with the enjoyment of British constitutional liberty! and where the time honoured and glorious Red Cross of St. George might still have waved victorious, now floats in triumph the 'Stars & Stripes' of a new & rival power. Such were its effects in the old colonies, and such must be its effects here if persisted in. Let the

people of Upper Canada then who are loyal and true at heart, implore a beneficent Providence, to vouchsafe to them, a speedy and safe deliverance from the like perils. Let them "struggle zealously and earnestly" for British responsibility, and with it an "eternal connexion" with the British Empire.

I am now to consider is colonial responsibility consistent with the Constitution?—By the constitutional act, 31st of George III, we are allowed to have a council 'for the affairs of the Province,' not for any particular or special affair, but *the* affairs. Had the act said, for its decision on a Militia claim or a U. E. right, or any other special, or express matter, the power of the council, its duties and prerogatives, might be said to be defined and limited by law; but when 'the affairs of the province' are expressly stated, to be within the duty of the Council, then there can be no room for cavil, or doubt, as to its extent, or limitation—all things that can, with propriety, be termed 'the affairs of the Province,' are clearly and by the express letter of the constitution, within the sphere of its action; while all things foreign to 'the affairs of the Province,' are foreign to the duty of the council. This is the plain and obvious reading of the constitution itself. Independent of the *letter* of the constitutional act, the *spirit* of all free governments is on the same side. To a clear and observant mind; indeed to any person at all acquainted with history, it must be obvious, that in no free country can government, be conducted, either with advantage or satisfaction, if opposed in its important measures, by the people. In many matters, the servants of the crown may be, and indeed often are in a minority in the legislature, without any serious interruption to the general harmony ensuing but when the legislative and executive powers meet in hostile array, upon any cardinal question, it is plain that one party or the other must recede, or the general tranquillity & safety will be jeopardised. But although I give it as my opinion that in such a case, the advisers of the Governor should give way; still I am far from supposing that the representatives of the people, as well as their rulers, may not err—they may come to hasty and erroneous conclusions, and arrive at doctrines which if carried out, would sap the foundation of the very constitution itself. In such a

case
inter
with
firm
imm
lution
ble
views
other
have
could
the c
public
Immo
bertie
and i
has p
consti
shoul
except
Pitt
althou
Comm
morec
the So
Such
these
tington
positio
cause
decla
those
Cabin
to recu
very n
ily i
cip
i
and
precis
Govern
solemn
terfere
be issu
Colonial
would i
read at
service.
situation
whom a
accordi
we are
form of

case it would be the duty of the council, instead of receding from the Governor and withdrawing from his confidence to remain firm in their course, and advise an immediate appeal to the people by a dissolution of the Assembly, within a reasonable time; should the people support the views of the council, well and good; if otherwise the provincial judgment would have been clearly pronounced, and it could not conduce to the public weal, that the council should longer continue in the public service. Ever since the days of the Immortal Prince of Orange, when the liberties of the people were fixed on a secure and imperishable foundation, this practice has prevailed in England, and when it is constitutional and conservative there, why should we not enjoy it here? The single exception may be taken to 1786, when Mr. Pitt did not retire from the public service although a large majority of the House of Commons, were opposed to him; he was moreover supported by the Lords and by the Sovereign, & he eventually succeeded. Such doctrines are however, exploded in these days. In 1829, the Duke of Wellington and Sir R. Peel, gave up their opposition to 'Catholic Emancipation,' because the commons had so frequently declared for it. And again in 1835, both those eminent statesmen, retired from the Cabinet, after many unsuccessful attempts to secure a majority in the commons. The very nature of a free constitution, necessarily involves responsibility without which principle, the name is but a mockery. If there is to be no direct and immediate accountability within the colony, it is absurd of a colonial administration; better to repeal the constitution at once, than Mr. Stephen, or whatever other man writes the colonial despatches, send out the orders of his master, with 'precise instructions' to the Lieutenant Governor to enforce them, without the solemn farce of a nominal legislative interference—let the 'precise instructions' be issued from Downing Street to each Colonial Governor; just as an 'order' would issue from the Horse Guards to be read at the head of every regiment in the service. We should then know our exact situation and form of government, and by whom administered, and govern ourselves accordingly:—but if, on the other hand, we are to have a free and representative form of government, let us have that local

independence and responsibility which its spirit guarantees—let us not be mocked with the name deprived of its reality; the name without the gain. I do not ask to introduce this principle into the working of our colonial government, as 'the device of a cunning man;' as an unpractical theory doubtful in its results and consequences. Both systems, the responsible and irresponsible, have been tried; the former in England, the latter in Canada; one has succeeded, the other has failed; one has produced charity, power and wealth, the other sanguinary strife, weakness and poverty; one has stood the test of ages, the other cannot stand a century. But viewing the matter even as a mere experiment, its trial is perfectly safe, because if (as is contended by its adversaries) it would lead to separation from the mother country, the moment such an attempt would be made by a colonial cabinet, the British Government would possess the same power to crush it that it possesses at present. The experiment (if experiment it can properly be called,) would not weaken or diminish British supremacy in the colony, wrest a single fortress from its grasp, a heart from its allegiance, or a bayonet from its defence. It would be as free and as powerful to crush rebellion then, as it is now. The only difference, it seems to me, which the introduction of the British principle, into the practical administration of our colonial government, would effect, would be this. It would place the Executive government of the province, at the head of public opinion, instead of leaving it at the tail. It would station a steady, vigilant and constitutional pilot, at the helm of public sentiment, directing the various adverse winds and currents by which it is continually assailed into safe and legitimate channels; instead of, as at present, placing itself in direct opposition to that sentiment, blocking up the currents and concentrating the floods, until at length they resist all barriers, and burst forth with overwhelming violence, against all impediments and opposition.

In New Brunswick, the late Governor Sir Archibald Campbell, refused to comply with the wishes of the Assembly, which body declared that they wanted several reforms, and had no confidence in the Governor's advisers to carry them through. Sir Archibald dissolved the Assembly and appealed to the people; they

confirmed the opinion expressed by their representatives, and again returned them to Parliament; the new House sent home Messrs. Crane and Wilmot, as delegates to the Colonial office: what was the result? Sir Archibald Campbell was recalled; Sir John Harvey was appointed; he chose for his Council, men who secured a majority in the local Parliament; and from that day to this, that excellent and popular Governor, Sir John Harvey, rules the Province in peace, harmony, loyalty and prosperity. What other principle, then, had responsible government introduced, but *a change of men*, and with them, some necessary *local reforms*? And if so, we surely cannot suppose that the holding of the office of Attorney or Solicitor General, of Queen's Counsel, Inspector, or Receiver General, or any similar appointment, by A. B. or C. or by X. Y. or Z. can lead to or bring about separation. Let us then have responsible government in Upper Canada, as our fellow-colonists have in New Brunswick; and instead of having hundreds of traitors to contend with at home, and hundreds of sympathisers to repel from abroad, we shall be as loyal a people as the gallant New Brunswickers; and following their noble example, we shall freely offer our men and our money, to the neighboring colonies, should they need our assistance. Say then Britons of Upper Canada, shall we continue this little mound of partition, which a self interested 'Compact' has erected between ourselves and the glorious constitution of our mother country, or shall we come out boldly, as Britons & loyal subjects should do, to level it with the dust, and to erect upon its foundation, the Pillar of British Liberty, with the Flag of the constitution floating from its loftiest tower?

My fifth proposition is to consider whether Colonial responsibility, is a British, or an American custom.

There can be no person acquainted with English annals, who will deny that responsibility—immediate, direct and unequivocal—in every department of the Executive government, is a "part & parcel" of the Constitution itself—that it is so interwoven with the customs and practices of Britain, as to be considered the modern *Magna Charta* of the Parliament of the Empire. Responsibility on the part of the Executive to the people's representatives, is characteristic of the British name—it is

blended with the very nature of her political institutions; and it is the most distinguishing and prominent principle of the compact between the British Sovereign & the British People—it is written as clear as with a sunbeam, in every page of her legislative history. In the mother country we behold her Majesty so far consulting the wishes of the people, as to continue no Minister in Office, no matter how powerful by connexion, or how great or varied may be his talents, except he possess the confidence of the nation, as expressed through its representatives in Parliament; while here, on the other hand, we behold that Sovereign's deputy, continuing his Advisers in office, whether they possess the confidence of the people or not!—Here then, is the great distinction and the true source of all our difficulties. The Sovereign in England, administers the Constitution according to *British principles*; while the Governor in Canada, administers it according to *American practice*. The Queen's deputy is allowed to do more in the capital of Canada than the Queen herself can do in the capital of England, the very heart of her Empire! *He* may act as a powerful and colonially irresponsible despot, while *She* must act as a Constitutional and limited Monarch! In England, the government must be carried on, with the approbation of Parliament; here it may be conducted in defiance of it! Surely then there is nothing of British practice, British principle, British feeling, in such a course. It is quite unnecessary that I should load few pages with quotations from stone, or from any of the modern literary works of eminent Englishmen, the principle and practice at home, well known to be doubted or questioned. But if any thing were needed to bring the practice down to the very latest date, and from the very highest authority, what do recent events open to our view? Do we not read that in England even His Grace the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel, the highest "tory" and "prerogative" statesmen of modern times, actually declare that the Queen's confidential advisers are responsible to Parliament, even for the very *Household appointments*; aye even down to her Majesty's waiting maids. Yet, here forsooth, we can have no parliamentary responsibility, even for the highest and most important offices in the colo-

ny. Ho
system,
ing and
cannot.
is not a
yet, it is
as define
written i
It is a st
ages of e
of the pe
blood wh
to their
mids of
Egyptian
and cust
prerogati
ted: it is
a Bower
it is not
only for
captivate
ments on
whose l
protection
be comp
traced by
of Engla
thirsty an
relief; t

"Prize
"Ye Po

An irre
ment, ins
British,

most
is

a
ing dire
tability,
into all h
hands an
his God,
try. Th
secrecy a
decoit its
ed by se
confiden
and cons
can only
at the b
mouth—
stowed g

ny. How can men who uphold such a system, say they are Britons in heart, feeling and practice? Most assuredly they cannot. Although the British constitution is not a body of *written law*, as ours is; yet, it is as clear, as simple, as noble, and as defined, as that portion of it, which is written in the pages of Magna Charta.—It is a stupendous column, erected after ages of experience; endeared to the hearts of the people of England, by the toil and blood which cemented it; and as visible to their 'mind's eye,' as were the Pyramids of the Pharaohs to the optics of an Egyptian. It is a compendium of laws and customs, of practices and usages, of prerogatives admitted, of concessions granted: it is a Throne erected by Reason; a Bower where Liberty delights to dwell: it is not perfumed by annuals that bloom only for a season, nor adorned by tinsel to captivate the eye; its odour and its ornaments emanate from that Divine Being, whose blessings it supplicates; whose protection it has experienced; may truly be compared to the 'Table of the Law,' traced by an invisible finger upon the heart of England; the fountain to which the thirsty and oppressed Englishman flies for relief; the Mount Sinai of a Briton.

"Prize it ye Ministers; ye Monarchs spare,

"Ye Patriots guard it with a Miser's care."

An irresponsibly administered government, instead of being allied to any thing British, in name, nature, or practice; is the most conspicuous feature of a Democracy. It is a Democrat by birth; in principle it is fallacious; in practice, it is reckless and yankee; since the glorious great & good King William, has assumed any part of the open, "be just and fear not" conduct of a true Briton, who, instead of evading direct, immediate & present accountability, is proud of it; solicits a scrutiny into all his actions; and stands with clean hands and an open heart, responsible to his God, to his sovereign and to his country. The irresponsible system is that of secrecy and the ballot; its foundation if decoit its principle is distrust it is protected by secrecy: it discards affection and confidence: sets at naught the natural and constitutional fealty of the people and can only be preserved in the ascendant—at the bayonet's point or the cannon's mouth—it is the dear bought and ill bestowed gift, which costs the heavily taxed

people of England *three millions annually*, which lines the pockets of the few in Up. Canada, but impoverishes the many—it is but a polished counterfeit, which a few years currency, will strip of its tinsel gloss, or a few years disuse, corrode and rot. Under its fair but fallacious face, its garb of white, but its heart of sable—Gen. Jackson, when President, put the legislative enactments in his pocket; turned his back upon the public will, and his heel upon the public neck. Under the same irresponsible cloak, did Governor Ritner, of Pennsylvania, follow the example of the President to an almost alarming extent. Nor did the latter President himself, confine his despotic and irresponsible powers to the carrying away of the public bills; but extended it to the appointment of Ambassadors to foreign courts, not only without the consent of Congress but even against its expressed wishes. Yet are we told that the United States is a responsible form of government; and the great number of murders and the great laxity of law are constantly appealed to, to show how badly it works and how numerous are the evils it entails on society! If there is any responsibility it is not founded on the *British principle or the British practice*; but after the fashion of republicanism; which, it would seem, affords rather a nominal, than a real responsibility; as a thousand acts have amply demonstrated. I have already quoted a few prominent instances during the administration of President Jackson, and Governor Ritner; but I find the same principle fully carried out, by the present President, Mr. Van Buren; for example,—(and perhaps a contrast would be the best example)—upon a mere question of colonial policy, the British Ministry went out of office, having only a bare majority of *five* to support them, in the House of Commons, last May; and this on the Jamaica question: while in the "great Republic" we have seen measures come directly from the President and his Cabinet, *five times in succession rejected by Congress*; and yet, both President and Cabinet keep their places. Now, here then, we have the contrast—in Britain direct and immediate responsibility—in the United States, dogged and unaccountable chicanery. Still we are referred to the United States, as a responsible form of Government!!! Surely the enemies of domestic responsibility, must be hard

driven when they resort to such an artifice to deceive its supporters: but the web is too thin to cheat even a school-boy.—Those who support British responsibility, or British principles, and in a British colony, look to Britain and to Britain only, for the workings of the system—let those who desire petty tyranny, and star chamber responsibility, look to the U. States for examples; those who desire British responsibility have no occasion to go abroad to look for examples. An irresponsible colonial government, is but another name for a Roman Pro-Consulate—it may suit the capacity of a minor, as milk will the stomach of an infant; maturity requires meat as well as milk; and no Proconsular form of government can be permanent where the stream of domestic responsibility, does not supply the milk that nourishes and the meat that strengthens to maturity, and gives to manhood its life, vigour and elasticity.

My sixth proposition is, are the people of Upper Canada deserving of the benefits of its introduction?

Under this head, I would remark, that in this colony, as well as in all others, there are religious, local, political and party differences: in fact, I view them as essential to the purity of the community, and to the stability, if not the existence, of all free governments—they are inseparable from the varied and ever varying opinions of man; they will find life and form, as long as our fallen nature has an existence. In England, we find the greatest jealousy of, and opposition to, the great contending parties; but *there*, there is no treason against the state: but simply Whigs against Tories; Ministers against Oppositionists; or, in other words, the *Ins* against the *Outs*, and *vice versa*. Here, every man, no matter how loyal, who asks for the introduction of the British principle of responsibility, in the administration of the colonial government, is denounced as a rebel and traitor to his country! It is in vain to urge that through his whole life he has been a devoted loyalist; that through the partial insurrections and invasions of 1837, 1838, and 1839, he rushed to the post of danger, and volunteered to expose his body to every passing bullet; nay, even the wounds upon his own body, received in his country's defence, are not sufficient to screen him from the malignant opposition of antagonists, or to hush to silence the

calumny, of the secret and irresponsible enemy. These observations I regret to say, not only apply to myself individually, but are also continually applied to all those who support the same principles! As applied to myself, I care nothing about them; the whole history of my political life, and the evidence which I always carry about my person, are the best answers I could give to such calumnies; but as applied to the great bulk of the people, I would say, they are either true or false—those who utter them, may take either horns of the dilemma. If true, then it demonstrates a very unwholesome state of society, and one that ought not to be allowed to continue: if false, it ought never again to be repeated; but to be at once and forever abandoned. No country can prosper where disloyalty is allowed to flourish; the utmost latitude should be given to a conscientious difference of opinion in all matters whether religious or political; but all causes for treason and disloyalty ought to be immediately removed—this I apprehend is the true science of government, and without its application no country can prosper. Governor Simcoe, the first Representative of Majesty in Upper Canada, told the assembled representatives of the people, in their first Parliament, that ours was the “very image and transcript” of the constitution of the mother-country.—Well do the great bulk of the people of Upper Canada deserve that free and glorious constitution, and rationally and bravely have they defended it. Though one generation had torn from the ancestors of them, all their earthly possessions, the homes of their fathers; and dread of another stared them in the face, yet, was not the altar of British loyalty prostrated in their hearts—the professions of Hull, and the multitudes of Wilkinson, were not able to allure their allegiance, or damp their valour—the internal treason of Mackenzie, Duncombe & Phillips; and the external threats and promises of Sutherland, Van Ransselaer and Von Shultz, fell alike still born, lifeless and sterile, on their manly hearts. And are not the Emigrant Britons, as well as those who forfeited their all, rather than their connexion with Britain, and who braved foreign foes and domestic traitors, in perpetuation of that connexion, entitled to some respect? Do they not deserve all the rights of the Empire, for the integ-

rity of
cessfully
deny to
of their
forth be
a rare
lic score
a subject
any of
John C.
George
“gener
this ‘n
Hav
system,
Britain
same d
Old Col
ty is pe
tution—
custom—
Canada
producti
the se
origin a

The
ity on
has bee
kenzie
Englan
while h
demand
Constitu
as I sh
Simcoe
session
of Uppe
itants,
ciple of
unequiv
‘have
‘author
‘Great
‘has es
‘and a
‘tain in
in his c
he not
ments
he req
People
that it
tem o
were t
forms
Great
junctu
to exp

rity of which they have so nobly, so successfully struggled? Let the man who will deny to such a people, the common rights of their fellow-subjects in Britain, stand forth before the people of Upper Canada, a *rara avis* for the public gaze and the public scorn. But why need I write upon such a subject; it is only necessary to refer to any of the numerous despatches of Sir John Colborne, Sir Francis Head, or Sir George Arthur, to establish the 'devoted,' 'generous' and 'enthusiastic' loyalty, of this 'noble British Province.'

Having shown that the responsible system, inflicts deep injury upon both Britain and Canada—that it produces the same effects here that attended it in the Old Colonies—that domestic responsibility is perfectly consistent with the constitution—that it is a British not an American custom—and that the people of Upper Canada, are eminently entitled to its introduction—I now proceed to enquire, in the *seventh* place what has been its origin and progress in the Colony.

The system of domestic responsibility on domestic questions as in England; has been termed the child of Rolph, Mackenzie & Co., but such is not the fact. In England, it is as old as the Revolution; while here it has been either promised, or demanded, since the first days of the Constitution, down to the present hour, as I shall presently prove. Governor Simcoe in his opening speech at the first session, of the first Provincial Parliament of Upper Canada, promised to the inhabitants, the introduction of this vital principle of the Constitution, in the following unequivocal and emphatic words. "I have summoned you together, under the authority of an Act of the Parliament of Great Britain, passed last year; which has established the British Constitution, and all the forms which secure and maintain it, in this distant Colony." And again in his closing speech, of the same Session, he not only reiterated the same sentiments; but in the most emphatic manner, he requested the representatives of the People, to explain to their constituents, that it was not the piebald, mutilated system of irresponsibility, by which they were to be governed, but by the pure forms and practices of the Parliament of Great Britain. His words are "At this juncture, I particularly recommend to you, to explain that this province is singularly

blessed not with a mutilated Constitution, but with a Constitution which has stood the test of experience, and is the image & transcript of that of Great Britain." Nor was the promise left undemanded. In the days of Mr. Justice Thorp, it was amply discussed, and loudly demanded. In 1818, (eleven years ago,) the Hon. Robert Baldwin, brought the subject prominently forward, in his address to the electors of the Town of York, (now the City of Toronto.) In the same year it was introduced into an address to the Throne, adopted at a public Meeting, held in the capital of the Province; of which William Warren Baldwin Esquire, was Chairman; and the present Lord Stanley, in his reply to Doctor Baldwin, not only declared that the supplies might be stopped, if a really responsible character should not be given to the Executive Council," but also made use of the following words. "I do however think, that some thing might be done with great advantage to give a really responsible character to the Executive Council which at present, is a perfectly anomalous body hardly recognized by the constitution and effective chiefly as a source of patronage." In the following year (1829) the subject was again introduced, in the reply of the House of Assembly to the speech from the Throne, made by Sir John Colborne. In the next Parliament (which was a Conservative one,) the same principle was insisted upon, as the following extract from the Journals will prove. "We cannot think it was intended, (by the constitutional act,) to give a power of interference with our internal affairs: against such an interference, we respectfully, but *plainly protest*, as inconsistent with those sacred principles, which are essential to a free government: since it is manifest that if your Majesty's Ministers, at a distance of more than four thousand miles, and not at all *controllable by, or accountable to*, your Majesty's subjects here and possessing necessarily a slight & imperfect knowledge of the circumstances of the country: the wants and habits and feelings of the inhabitants, and the mode of transacting business amongst us, can dictate a different course, in relation, to measures effecting ourselves only, FROM THAT WHICH THE PEOPLE BY THEIR REPRESENTATIVES, and with the concurrence of the other branches of the Provin-

cial Legislature have chosen, we are reduced to a state of mere dependence upon the will and pleasure of a ministry that are *irresponsible to us*, and beyond the reach and operation of *the public opinion of the Province.*" The stoutest and ablest advocates, for responsible Government never asked for more than is contended for in this address, and the remainder of the same document, is couched in language fully as strong and decided, as the paragraph I have quoted; yet it was supported by every Member then in the House; except one (Mr. Jesse Ketchum,) and in the number of its advocates, I find recorded, the names of Sir Allan McNab, the *Honorables* James Crooks, Alexander Fraser, William Morris, Philip Van Koughnett, and John Wilson, as well as *fourteen* of the highest Tory Members in the House of Assembly. *Vide* Commons Journals 1837 and 8. Page 144.

And again in the 2d Session of the 12th Parliament, the same principle was again insisted upon and adopted, with the dissenting voices of Messrs. Boulton and Malloch alone; as the following resolution of the House itself will prove:—

"Resolved—That this House considers the appointment of a RESPONSIBLE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, to advise the Lieut. Governor, or person administering the Government, on the affairs of this Province, to be ONE OF THE MOST HAPPY AND WISE FEATURES in our Constitution, and ESSENTIAL in our form of Government, and as being one of the strongest securities, for a just and equitable administration of the Government, and full enjoyment of our civil and religious rights and privileges."

For this resolution, the whole House, with the exception of two members, voted; there being 55 present, of which number 53 are recorded as *yeas*, and only two as *nays*; and in the list of its supporters, I find not less than 21 high Tories, including Sir Allan Macnab, Judge McLean, Mr. W. Robinson, (brother to the Chief Justice,) and Mr. Attorney-General Hagerman! And on the same day, (the 14th of March, 1836,) the same sentiments were embodied in an address to the Crown and passed by the House. Now it will be remembered that up to this time, all men and all parties, supposed the Executive Council, advised the Governor, upon the affairs of the province, and therefore it was, that all parties united, in demanding "a responsible Executive Council;" but before the clock had struck 12 that night, Sir Francis Head, had given *new light* to Mr. Hagerman, Sir Allan Macnab and others, and by the next morning, they

were prepared to unsay and to undo, all they had done the day before! Alas, for our fallen nature, that one man could so soon influence so many of one species to act contrary to the course they had so long and so deliberately considered to be right! Surely when we have it recorded that such men as Sir Allan Macnab, Judge McLean and Mr. Hagerman, deliberately declared that "a responsible Executive Council was one of the happiest features in our constitution," there can be little of either principle, consistency or truth, in those who charge the advocates of the same principle, with being rebels and traitors, for supporting it! Nor, had I room or time, should I desire to stop here: I could show that the authority of almost all public men in the province has been at times exercised, in favor of this vital constitutional principle. In the famous Report upon the State of the Province, drawn up by Mr. Hagerman, signed by a majority, if not by all, of the members; and afterward adopted by a vote of the whole House, (the present Parliament of Sir Francis Head as it has been called,) we are told, "That the people are intelligent as well as patriotic, and WHEN LEFT TO THEMSELVES, in the free exercise of their constitutional rights, they have ever proved able to apply the necessary remedy to any attempt to oppress or mislead them." This is exactly the principle of responsibility, and it is all that the warmest Briton contends for, or can desire. If the intelligence and patriotism of the people is such, as is here described, why not allow them "to apply the remedy," which that patriotism demands? Why, in fact, should not the public servants be responsible to public intelligence and patriotism? I will quote a few extracts from the writings and speeches of public men and public presses, to show how general and constant has been the desire, in all the colonies, for the introduction of the responsible system.

"With such information, I shall be enabled to accomplish much towards the object I have in view—namely, the obtaining responsible government in all the British Colonies."—*Vide*, Letter from Henry S. Chapman, Esq. to Joseph Howe, Esq. M. P. for Halifax, Nova Scotia, 18th July 1835.

"If you really desire to continue the connexion with Britain, until these Colonies have grown up to 'man's estate'—until they are riper in knowledge, virtue and resources, than I think they are now—and merely seek such changes and reformations as are essential to their peace and prosperity—to the controlling of local factions, and the enjoyment of economical and responsible government then will I go with you, heart and hand, and what is much more consequence, the great bulk of the people of these Provinces, will go with you also." *Vide*, Mr. Howe's reply to Mr. Chapman's letter, 2nd October, 1835.

"These are circumstances that require full investigation and the House of Assembly having just confidence in the wisdom, determination and vigour of the Governor General, that such investigation will be rigorously instituted—that the Officers of the Crown, will be subjected to due responsibility—that the seats of justice will be purified: but above all that the rights & privileges of the Commons House of Assembly, will be preserved in their inviolability." Vide, Address of the House of Assembly of Newfoundland, to the Earl of Durham, 1839.

"Resolved, That the errors into which the Right Hon. the Earl of Durham has fallen, in his Lordship's Report on the state of these Provinces, so far as they relate to the numbers of the Roman Catholic population of Upper Canada, and to the alleged hostility of Orangemen, while they are subjects of regret to the Grand Lodge; yet they cannot at the same time, prevent the Members of this Institution from expressing their assent to the general accuracy of His Lordship's statements, and their desire to see many of his suggestions carried into practical effect, particularly a thorough local responsibility, upon all matters of domestic government, which great healing measure is so eminently calculated to restore peace to those distracted Colonies, promote their future greatness and prosperity, and secure their 'eternal connection' with the Parent State. Vide, Resolution unanimously adopted by the Grand Orange Lodge of British North America, at its Grand Annual Meeting, 11th June, 1839.

Let us now have a few extracts from the Press, with which I shall close this head of the discussion:

"If the Governors are to continue to act the part of mere puppets, and to move only as they are moved by those who happen for the time being, to occupy the Colonial office, as has been mostly the case heretofore, we could dispense with them altogether. Steam navigation has gone far to annihilate the distance between us, and our Downing street Directors, and the experiment might now be made of governing us entirely by Despatches, without the intervention of any one aping Majesty, and only capable of injuring us by imbecility. Is it consistent with the interests of the country, and we may add, its connection with Britain, that this absurd intermeddling of the Colonial Office, should be longer permitted?" Vide, Montreal Morning Courier, 19th October, 1839. Edited by Mr. Mitchell, an Englishman, and a Barrister.

"Let there then be a merging of minor differences, and a Union of all political parties, in favour of this great healing measure, of making the Executive Council responsible, and we shall arise from the dust—be ashamed of what we are—ashamed of what we have been—and unable to compute what we are destined to attain." Vide, Toronto Mirror, 19th October, 1839. Edited by Mr. Carey, an Irishman.

"We have no hesitation in avowing, that we advocate a Responsible Provincial Administration, as the only Constitutional remedy for our long accumulating grievances. We wish to see the Government administered in harmony with the House of Assembly, whether it be Whig, Tory or Radical, and we are persuaded it can be administered in no other way, unless with the assistance of British bayonets. But although strongly advocating responsible government, as far as our internal affairs are concerned, we are equally determined to maintain the supremacy of the Mother Country, in our foreign relations." Vide, the Toronto "Examiner," 3rd July, 1838. Edited by Mr. Hincks, an Irishman.

"We maintain that the English, Irish and Scotch inhabitants of Canada, as well as the natives of the Province on the Western side of the Atlantic, are just as worthy to enjoy the privileges and advantages of the British Constitution, as are the inhabitants of Great Britain and Ireland, on the eastern side of the Atlantic." Vide, Toronto Christian Guardian, 17th July, 1839. Edited by Mr. Ryerson, a Canadian, and Organ of the British Wesleyan Methodist Conference in Canada.

"It being presumed that the Lieutenant Governor, however versed in the constitutional rights and Imperial interests in the Colony, could not possibly of his own knowledge become acquainted with our LOCAL details, and in consequence, for the purpose of carrying into effect the local policy of our Provincial Legislature, must be guided by the advice of those, whose residence in the Colony and engagements in conducting the heads of Departments, have enabled them to form opinions in their several branches, from observation and experience. To guide his Excellency in such matters, he is empowered to call to his

councils, such persons as he may deem best qualified to afford that advice which may enable him to carry on the executive functions of his station, in all that relates to the LOCAL affairs in accordance with the spirit of our Provincial enactment:—the Imperial interest in the Colony being of course wholly under the control of Downing st. For this purpose, a counterpart of those through whose interposition the Crown can do no wrong, and who are responsible for their advice, which the Crown is bound to seek and they to give, was originally intended to be afforded to this Province by our provincial constitution under the title of the "Executive Council." The constitutionality and advantage of such a Council has been totally abrogated in this Province, by the principle as laid down by the late Lieutenant Governor "that though bound to call them together, he was not compelled to consult them;" & the fact of their functions having been wholly usurped by the self constituted and irresponsible body, usually designated as the "Family Compact" who have so long used an undue influence in the affairs of the Colony, and in truth controlled and guided the executive functions of the government, around which they form a barrier through which none but those devoted to their interest can possibly obtain a passage." Vide, Peterborough Backwoodsman, 5th July, 1839. Edited by Mr. Darcus, J. P. an Irishman.

"We do assert, and on this ground we take our stand, that the Governor is bound by that power which granted a Representative System to Canada, to submit to the opinions of the Parliament which may have been elected in consequence of that appeal, and to the advice of a council who are nominated by the Governor because they are known to possess the confidence of such Parliament."—Vide, Hamilton Journal, 19th July, 1839. Edited by Dr. Thomas, an Englishman.

"We cannot see why an extension of this principle, judiciously managed, should tend to a dismemberment of the Empire. If, for instance, the Governor's Council should consist of the Heads of Departments, chosen from men the best qualified to fill their various appointments, and of gentlemen of high professional attainments, some of whom should hold seats in both Houses of Parliament, as is the case with the leading Ministers at home; if, we say, those gentlemen were held responsible to this country but subject to the Imperial Veto, as they would, in what manner could that responsibility endanger the connection with the Mother Country?" Vide, Toronto Palladium, 19th July, 1839. Edited by Mr. Fothergill, J. P. an Englishman, and the former Representative for the County of Durham.

"British freemen, accustomed to the working of the British Constitution, will not endure a system which renders representative government a farce, by placing the full power of the state in the hands of men who are independent of the people's representatives, and in no shape or sense accountable to them for any improper or illegal act. Men who have been accustomed to see their votes influence the government, and produce a prompt agreement with the opinions of a majority, naturally reject a system which renders their votes useless, and enables the cabal who rule to set their votes at defiance for a series of years, with impunity. It would not be easy to devise a plan that could produce greater irritation than this. If we had no pretence to the British Constitution, but were avowedly under the sole control of a few irresponsible men, at any rate we should not be disappointed. We should expect nothing liberal or equal, and having no right to interfere with the government, we could not complain that it never regarded us. But to be mocked with a shadow yet denied the substance; to be told that we are governed under the British Constitution, yet be denied the vital principle which is essential to its successful working, is to add insult to injury, and to give us a stone when we ask for bread." Vide, Kingston Herald, 23rd July, 1839, Edited by Mr. Waudby, an Englishman.

I have before me the St. Catharines Journal of the 11th of July, the Niagara Reporter of the 5th of July, the Brockville Recorder of the 25th of July, the Montreal Morning Courier for July and Aug. the Nova Scotian for July, and an almost innumerable number of other colonial journals, from which I might quote, did my time, or space permit. I have also before me, the resolutions adopted at public meet-

ings, he did within the last month at Niagara, at Thorah and Mara, in the Home District: at Haldimand, Brighton, Colborne, and Eldon, in the Newcastle district; at Trentport, in the Victoria district; and at Galt, Dundas, Guelph, Preston, and Hamilton, in the Gore district; at all of which resolutions in favor of responsible government were adopted; but I really deem it unnecessary to copy them; the public sentiment being so well known, and so clearly expressed upon the subject, that not a single meeting, or petition, or address has been attempted in opposition, in any part of the province: I will, therefore, pass on, in the *eighth* and *last* place, to consider some objections that have been made against the introduction of the responsible principle. These objections I shall notice seriatim, as I have read them, or heard them; and in the plainest and most simple manner, so that every man may distinctly understand the nature of the objection, and the effect of the reply.

1st Objection.—A responsible government would render useless the functions of the Governor, the Executive and Legislative Councils, and all that would be required would be, the Clerk of the Assembly to record, and the Sergeant at Arms to enforce, the acts of that body.

Reply.—If there is any force in this objection, it applies with more effect to the Commons of the Empire than to the Commons of the Province—the former claims and exercises an Imperial responsibility; supreme & uncontrollable over every portion of the Empire; whereas, the latter solicits only a local, limited, and comparatively unimportant responsibility; besides, the Legislative Council is a balancing power, independent of the Assembly, and can at any time, as the Lords do in England, cast the shield of its authority, between the Executive Government, and an unwarrantable approach of the Assembly. I contend only for the English system; and in England, the practice sought for, has not been found to produce the effect dreaded.

2nd Objection.—Colonial responsibility would so weaken and unhinge the powers of the Imperial Government, as to practically dis-unite the colony and the Parent State.

Reply.—So far from producing such a result, that it appears to me, it would knit & unite them much closer—it would assi-

mmilate the workings of both constitutions in their practical details—it would confer only a *local*, not a *general* responsibility, leaving every prerogative of the Crown untouched, inviolably observing every letter of the Constitutional Act, as it now is, vesting in the Sovereign for ever, the power of declaring war, and of making peace; of regulating and protecting our commerce with foreign nations; of appointing our Governors; keeping our garrisons; negating our acts; dissolving our Parliaments, and calling them together at pleasure; selecting his Ministers, and, on the English principle, dismissing them when he pleases; appointing one branch of the co-ordinate Legislature for life; or even rendering it hereditary, if found beneficial; in a word, not curtailing or diminishing in the city of Toronto, one single privilege, power, or prerogative, appertaining to the Sovereign in the city of London. Where, then, is the independence which must follow? Independent we would be, so far as our independence on the Colonial office, in the management of our domestic and local affairs are concerned, but no further; and this just and necessary independence, is what will prevent separation, and perpetuate the connexion, to the latest period of time.

3d Objection. Whenever a Colony enters upon the enjoyment of the rights of domestic responsibility, it ceases to be a Colony, subject to be legislated for by the Parent State, and becomes at once, a free and independent nation.

Reply. This objection is, in substance the same as the former; but as it has been repeated at different times, and in different language, I will discuss it a little more fully. And first, I would ask, has this local independence and responsibility, produced separation in the United States; where even the principles of Universal suffrage and the Ballot, are exercised?—No, so far from it, that we find nearly thirty states, declaring themselves 'free and independent,' sovereign and uncontrollable so far as their *local affairs* are concerned; yet, in relation to the *national interests*, forming but so many parts of a whole people. With this example before our eyes, an example almost at our very doors; how can it be said that local responsibility will naturally produce a division of the Empire? But it is not necessary that I should go to the United States for examples

I-won
that
provi
to th
don a
have
Magis
Alder
Judge
point
City S
—the
exper
and S
strai
and or
so far
venti
throug
Burde
when
as in
King.
the IV
—Nay
exercis
of Cor
and of
person
monstr
are as
indissol
interest
and leg
ties exi
alists o
as bein
they as
exercis
don an
unman
of self i
disorde
who are
so con
for exa
to the s
by its co
freedom
power,
by the c
to the
banded
as any
Plantati
Why the
penden
tion of

I would morely beg the reader to consider that no more is asked for by this whole province, than has been already conceded to the large Cities of the Empire—London and Dublin, for example. There they have the power of appointing their chief Magistrate, their Lord Mayors and their Aldermen, yes, and their Chief Criminal Judges too, called a Recorder—they appoint their Court of Conscience—their City Sheriffs, and their City Magistrates—they levy their City Taxes, and they expend them, they lay out new Streets, and Squares, and Lanes, and widen and straighten old ones—they make City Laws and ordinances—they carry their privileges so far, as even to exercise the right of preventing the Queen's subjects, from passing through the city; as in the case of Sir F. Burdett, under Lord Sidmouth's Warrant, when sent to the Tower for Libel: and as in the case of Sir Abraham Bradley King, Bart. (Lord Mayor,) with George the IV, when he visited Dublin, in 1820.—Nay more, they claim, and constantly exercise, the right of entering the House of Commons, with the Mace, and Regalia, and of presenting by the Lord Mayor, in person their humble petition, or Remonstrance. Yet after all this those cities are as loyal, as intimately connected, and indissolubly bound up, with the general interests of the Empire, as if no such local and legislative functions and responsibilities existed. Why then, should the Loyalists of Toronto, or Kingston, be taunted as being desirous of separation, because they ask for privileges, far short of those exercised by their fellow subjects, in London and Dublin? Away with such an unmanly insinuation; it is but the offspring of self interest; or the illusive shadow of a disordered mind. But as those persons, who are opposed to responsible government so constantly refer to the United States, for examples, allow me to refer once again to the same authority. The state of Ohio by its constitution "retains its sovereignty, freedom and independence, and every power, jurisdiction and right, which is not by the confederation, expressly delegated to the United States;" yet it is as firmly banded and knit, to the rest of the Union, as any one of our Colonies, Provinces or Plantations is, to the empire of Britain.—Why then, all this bugbear here about independence? Ohio has not half the population of the Canadas; yet has it a respon-

sible and independent government. We worship at the same altar—we speak the same language—we are descended from the same Sires—we are instructed in the same Sciences—we follow the same agricultural and commercial pursuits—our soil is equally fertile, and our climate much more healthy; yet, with all this our very Emigrants with all their British feelings and British habits, leave us for Ohio; and even our old grey-headed U. E's. with all their early prejudices against the Yankees, are leaving the province, as if it were "a land of pestilence and famine," and returning to a country, which but a few years ago, they sacrificed all their earthly possessions rather than live in.—Surely when we thus find British feelings and Canadian prejudices, alike give way to despondency, we cannot longer shut our eyes to the naked fact that there must be something wrong, in the body politic; some cankerous, eating worm, knawing at the heart, and preying upon the vitals of the Province; something which brings about that state of society, described by Addison, when he wrote.

"When vice prevails, and evil men bear sway"
 "The post of honour, is a private station."

4th Objection.—The principle of responsibility can never be extended to any *part* or *portion* of the British nation; but must be solely vested in the Imperial Government, which represents not only every particular *part* but the *whole* people of the Empire; and upon this principle, England is obliged to submit to Ireland and Scotland the balance of whose members, overturn the clearly expressed wishes of a majority of the English representation.

Reply.—This reasoning though specious, is entirely fallacious: so long as England and Wales were united in the kingdom of Great Britain, so long the responsible system existed in their Parliament alone. While Scotland remained as an independent kingdom, that is between the Union of the two Crowns and the two nations, she exercised the responsible system by her own Legislature alone, the principal measures for its deliberation being first prepared by the Lords of Articles; but when, in the reign of Queen Anne, she agreed to a Legislative Union, her responsibility was not abandoned, but *transferred*; it was not a *giving up*, but a *local removal*; it still adhered to her Nobles and her Commons, and with them was trans-

ferred from Holyrood-House to St. Stephen's Chapel. So long as she possessed her local legislature, she possessed her local responsibility; and when the former was transferred, the latter naturally adhered to it. The same may be said of Ireland. Previous to the Union under Geo. III, she had an independent Legislature, altho' in connexion with, and subject to, the Crown of England. Her case was entirely analogous to this province. She had her Vice-Roy, or representative of the Crown, by whose directions, the principal government measures were submitted to Parliament. She had her Upper and her Lower House also: but be it remembered, so long as she retained them, so long she retained her independence and her local responsibility. Many, and many were the stormy nights in which the Ministerialists and Oppositionists arrayed their respective forces against each other in the Irish House of Commons; when the eloquence of her Foster, her Flood, & her Ogle—her Grattan, and her Castlereagh,—her Bourke, and Wellsley Pole—her Curran, and her Toler—her Bush and her Maxwell Barry, were heard to resound thro' the domes of her once classic and splendid, but now silent and golden legislative halls. Great as were the powers of England's RUTLANDS, and TOWNSHENDS they could only retain their places at the Castle of Dublin, as the Deputies of England and the Viceroy of Ireland, so long as they could command a majority of the Irish Senate upon important questions of State-government: but the moment they ceased to have power they virtually ceased to be the Viceroys of the kingdom. What clearer proof can possibly be afforded of the principle of responsibility, being inherent in a local and independent legislature? Like Scotland, however, the Irish nation agreed to a Legislative Union with Great Britain, and the three kingdoms becoming thus incorporated into one legislature, the responsibility which was before *separate*, became *united*; but this did not *abolish*, but *change* the responsible system from the representatives of each separate kingdom, to the representatives of the whole. Should they sit separately and independently, in the capital of each kingdom, the responsibility would still appertain to them; and when they unite for the general purpose of a more extended legislature, it still adheres to them. By parity of reasoning, so long

as this province retains her separate Government and legislature, so long as she possesses a free constitution, so long she is entitled to a local responsibility: but should she receive a more direct incorporation into the Empire, by a Legislative Union; then, like Scotland and Ireland, her responsibility will be transferred from Toronto to London, and her representatives, instead of sailing down Erie, and up Ontario, will cross the Atlantic. And that we should, to a certain extent, be represented in the Imperial Parliament, is much to be desired, and the principle will, I hope, soon be conceded.

5th Objection.—The people do not desire local responsibility, because it would divest the Lieutenant-Governor of his proper patronage.

Reply.—There are two principles involved in this objection; the first, the wishes of the people: the second, the cause of those wishes. As to the first, it seems absurd to me to argue that the people do not desire responsible government, which simply means, in other words, that they do not desire the government to be conducted as they wish! To suppose that any set of men could desire a government to be conducted by persons in whom they have no confidence, in opposition to those who possess their confidence, is too preposterous a notion for serious discussion. As to the second part of the objection it is not only a very futile, but a very selfish one also. If the object of retaining this colony as an appendage of the Empire, is merely to confer the patronage of office, on a Lieutenant-Governor, let it be at once, openly avowed, and let us not be led to believe, that higher and nobler motives actuate the British nation. If, however, I must descend to the consideration of an objection so low, and petty, and selfish, my answer to it is this.—Under the present system, the Governor must advise with some one, because (and especially in the outer districts,) he knows not the parties qualified for office. Candidates for situations, must either apply themselves, or be recommended by some friendly influence. Whether then is it better that the appointment of Magistrates, Commissioners, Sheriffs, and other public functionaries, should pass under the review of the chosen representatives of the landed proprietary, and commercial enterprise of the province, and be selected by the Exe-

cutive
respo
they
the p
a pol
spon
6th
gov
ons a
Parli
it by
Re
an h
this
ment
it wou
to pas
to ch
riding
counc
shoul
all, I
shoul
is too
well r
factur
becaus
low m
neighb
7th
the mo
who v
possi
Rep
we hav
beside
weakn
ject un
under t
were o
the chr
side of
good m
and ma
The pu
motives
mies—i
alone, t
8th C
Govern
Reply
policy of
oppositi
system
age, and
member
ther, as
Lord Jo

cutive Council, who would be held directly responsible for the appointments; or that they should, as at present, be chosen upon the private reference of an Attorney-Gen. a political Judge, or some secret and irresponsible courtier?

6th Objection.—A responsible colonial government, might lead to foreign collisions and national wars, because the local Parliament might assume powers not given it by the constitution.

Reply.—I think it barely possible that an honest man could seriously advance this objection. If the provincial Parliament should attempt such an interference, it would have no more power to do so than to pass a law to hang a man for walking to church on a Sabbath-day, instead of riding in an air-balloon! Besides, the council should assent to it—the Governor should assent to it—and even if passed by all, British money and British troops should enforce it. But really the matter is too puerile to waste words about. As well might it be argued, that the manufacture of gunpowder should be prohibited, because, if made, some mischievous fellow might load a pistol, and shoot his neighbour through the head!

7th Objection. We should not forget the motives of Rolph, Bidwell, and others, who were the warmest advocates of responsible government.

Reply. With the motives of others we have nothing to do: they are wholly beside the question; and it only shows weakness in argument, to fly from the object under discussion, and seek shelter under the motives of some individuals, who were once its supporters. As well might the christian Faith, be stabbed through the side of Judas, or Annanias? Many a good measure was supported by bad men, and many an evil measure by good men. The public have nothing to do, with the motives, either of its friends, or its enemies—it is the measure itself, and that alone, they are called upon to discuss.

8th Objection. Even the present Whig Government of England, is opposed to it.

Reply. No person acquainted with the policy of modern Whiggery, can view their opposition as singular. The irresponsible system continues their power and patronage, and there is no instance, that I remember, where they have parted with either, as long as they could retain them.—Lord John Russell's opposition to respon-

sible government is not more natural than his Lordship's tenacity to cling to office; and the marquis of Normanby's despatches, are just as powerful with the government of Canada, as the Marchioness' influence is said to be, with the Government of England.

9th Objection. The Colonies now forming the United States of America, never obtained local responsibility, and why should it be granted to the Colonies, north of the line 45?

Reply. True, they did not unfortunately obtain local responsibility: and what was the result? Why simply that "they sought for and won their independence with the sword!" Do the objectors really desire, that such a crisis should arrive here: and that a similar result should follow the like causes? If so, they had better at once allow it.

10th Objection. We have had a taste of "the blessings of responsible government," in the profligate expenditure of Mr. Van Buren, at an Hotel in the City of N. York, where in six and a half days, he spent 676 dollars.

Reply. Admitting that the Americans had a responsible form of government, which I think I have clearly shewn they have not, at least after the British form; what I would ask, has the president's travelling expenses at an Hotel, to say to the question of responsible government in U. Canada? Why nothing absolutely nothing. But after all, what are those great expenses that have been blazoned forth with such triumph? Why about £25 a day! Surely those Gentlemen could never have thought of urging such a circumstance in opposition to responsible government, had they recollected that Lord Durham's travelling expenses, were about £30 a day, or 1,920 dollars for six days! But some people will make themselves laughed at whether or not.

11th Objection. A responsible government might lead to the dictation of "an irresponsible cut throat and mail robber, like Mackenzie."

Reply. Such an event would be highly improbable, if not impossible. Mackenzie when in the parliament of this province, and before he avowed his treasonable projects, never was a *Leader* in the Assembly; and although he generally acted *with* and *under* the Leaders just as Mr Fothergill, Mr. Dalton, Mr. Thomson, and

other Gentlemen did, in a former "Bidwell and Rolph parliament;" still we find by references to the Journals, and to his published speeches, that he not only constantly voted in the minority; but that he frequently heaped the most bitter abuses on the Leaders of the majority. And if such was the effect of his agitation, *before* he became an avowed Traitor and Murderer, and while he had innumerable and obvious grievances to stir up the public mind with, what would be the effect of his agitation *after*? Surely the answer is obvious. Can any man in his common senses suppose that the majority of the people of U. Canada, who have been described by Sir Francis Head in one of the very last supplementary chapters to his "Narrative," as possessing "a manliness of character which it is almost impossible to describe" would unite that "manliness of character" and their "noble British feelings" to the chariot-wheels of a cut throat, a mail robber, a murderer, and an incendiary? The bare supposition is a libel upon the Electors of Upper Canada; and the authors know it to be a libel. After the numerous and long continued perils and privations, which the people have suffered, to defend their soil from the ruthless hands of the invaders in 1812, 13 and 14, and from the unprovoked attack of the sympathisers in 1837, 8 and 9, it is treating them infinitely worse, than they have been treated by the Pirates, to be told after their many acts of heroism and suffering are over, that they are now ready to throw themselves into the arms of the enemy, and to become the champions of a cut throat and a murderer! Shame, utter shame, upon such calumniators. With as much justice might it be said, that the present responsible Parliament of England, would follow the example of the irresponsible Parliament of Cromwell, that brought CHARLES to the block!

12th Objection. A House of Assembly might be found that would pass such resolutions, or adopt such principles, as would so compromise the connexion with the mother-country, as to render separation an inevitable consequence.

Reply. It is more likely that a House of Assembly would pass such resolutions, or adopt such principles without the guidance and moderation of a responsible Ministry, than with it. The name, or the nature of the Governor's advisers, would

have nothing to say to the resolutions or principles of a traitorous House. If such a House could be found, and such resolutions would be adopted, it would be the duty of the Governor, whether his Council was responsible or not, to dissolve Parliament and appeal to the people; if a constitutional majority were returned all good; his council should possess their confidence; but if the same pack of rebels were sent back, and they reiterated their treasonable resolutions, the Governor might again dissolve the House, and give his reasons for doing so, if they persisted in returning avowed traitors to the connexion, it would then become his duty to prorogue Parliament, and to report the whole matter to the Home Government, for Imperial consideration and decision. This would be the obvious course, whether there was a responsible ministry or not: I cannot see that the responsible system would interfere with it, or prevent the just authority and supremacy of the mother-country, in such a case.

13th Objection. The ancient colonies of Greece and Rome were not favoured with the responsible principle.

Reply. Granted. But what has that to say to us? Are we to follow their example? Is Old England reduced to the pitiable plight that she must 'pick up crumbs' that fall from the tables of the Grecian, Roman, or Athenian Colonies? If so, then she must abolish our present representative form of government, and reduce us to the ancient condition of Scio!

14th Objection. A responsible government would destroy the authority of the Crown, and subject the government to the authority of the Assembly.

Reply. This principle, which has been so eagerly contended for by Mr. Hagerman, Mr. Sherwood, and the "Compact" in Upper Canada, is not only one of absolute despotism, but it is worse than the most naked despotism that has been yet attempted in modern times—because it is a *despotism without danger*—a poisoned dagger struck by an unknown hand! To establish this fact, it will only be necessary to quote a passage or two, from the report of the Select committee of the House of Assembly, on the state of the Province in 1837 and 8. This report from the pen of Mr. Hagerman, and signed by Mr. Sherwood, as Chairman, states, at page 28, that the responsible system "would utterly

destroy
would s
of the c
ions, o
have th
sembly.
told tha
tend to
and ge
upon th
tions,
soon as
are un
the fac
cenda
What i
those p
of the p
(for it
of Asse
ascenda
tion!"
Campb
as Atto
denoun
Comm
people
even an
after th
land wo
not onl
wood a
shine o
german
fice of
wood a
Counse
the pri
Instead
when t
the wh
is to co
generou
or!!!
If this
hand;
I don't
(to use
what he
do what
bility w
or the P
more, t
and Peo
only to
office, s
liance,
ons!!!
and self

destroy the authority of the Crown, and would subject the people to the government of the capricious and ever varying opinions, of the party that might chance to have the ascendancy in the House of Assembly." And again, at page 59, we are told that the British Government should extend to the Colonial Governors, "a liberal and generous share of confidence—rely upon their honor and follow their suggestions, and not deprive them of office, so soon as they are found to differ with, or are unreasonably complained against, by the faction that happens to be in the ascendant, in the Assembly, or out of it."—What is the plain and obvious meaning of those passages? First, that the majority of the people of the province of U. Canada—(for it must be a majority "in the House of Assembly, or out of it," to be "in the ascendant")—are denounced as "a faction!!" Is it to be supposed that Sir John Campbell, would continue *for one hour*, as Attorney General of England, did he denounce the majority of the House of Commons, and the majority of the whole people of England, as "a faction?" If even an attempt to retain him was made, after the use of such language, all England would be in arms in a week; yet here not only Mr. Hagerman and Mr. Sherwood are allowed to continue in the sunshine of Executive favour, but Mr. Hagerman has been since *promoted* to the office of Attorney General, and Mr. Sherwood *advanced* to the dignity of Queen's Counsel!!! Let us now see what does the principle of the paragraph imply.—Instead of appointing a new governor, when the old one loses the confidence of the whole people, the British Government is to continue him in office, to give him a generous confidence!! to rely on his honor!!! and to follow his suggestions!!!! If this is not the dagger *from the invisible hand*; or despotism *without danger*, then I don't know what is. The Governor may (to use Sir F. Head's language,) "say what he chose, write what he chose, and do what he chose," without any responsibility whatever, to the Courts, the People, or the Parliament of Upper Canada? Nay more, the remonstrances of Parliament and People to the British Government, are only to procure for him, continuance in office, strict confidence, an honorable reliance, and a following out of his suggestions!!! To what absurdities will despotism and self interest, lead their votaries!

15th Objection. The British Government want no responsible cabinet in the colonies to advise them, because they have ever shown alacrity in sending out commissioners, at great expense, to enquire into our complaints, and to correct them.

Reply. This argument only amounts to this, that a parcel of surgeons have been consulted, who admit the existence of disease, but prescribe no medicine or remedy! What better are such Surgeons than quacks, who admit the nature and extent of the disease, yet apply no medicine to cure? The Surgeons, it is true, are numerous. At one time, it was proposed to send us Lord Amherst; and next, Lord Canterbury—then followed Lord Gosford, like a Bashaw of three tails, with Sir Charles Grey, Sir G. Gipps, and Mr. Frederick Elliot, in his train—our appetite was next satiated by Sir F. Head, with "bread and butter"—then came the "Durham purge"—now the *lancet* is in the hands of Sir Geo. Arthur, and we know not the hour, when we may be honored by fresh pills, or a more powerful lotion than has yet been administered, from Lord Clarendon, Lord Dumfermline, and other skilful state physicians! But to be serious, what have all our commissions and commissioners, and all our committees of enquiry, and all our inquisitors general and special done for us?—why, nothing! nothing is to be done! But after *seriously thinking* from 1839 to 1842, they will *then consider* what will be best to be done!!! Where then is the weight in this objection? It is worse than useless to employ Doctors, if they kill, instead of cure.

I have now finished. Every article or speech, which I have recently seen upon the subject of responsibility, I have carefully noted, and selected from them every objection, which could at all be deemed worthy of attention. To those objections I have given candid, and I hope satisfactory replies—satisfactory I trust they will be to those for whom they have been specially written—to those brave and loyal men who are their country's pride and their country's strength—those who are its productive wealth in time of peace; and its right-arm of defence in the hour of danger—I mean the loyal, industrious, and ever to be respected Yeomanry of Upper Canada. If these observations shall prove satisfactory to them, I shall care but little for the malignant slanders, which the "Compact hacks" may hear

upon me; and with "MILESIUS," I will say that "I would blush to allow my humble name to figure in public or in private, as the coadjutor or fellow-labourer of the republican slanderers of Britain," on the one hand, or, on the other, with those fawning sycophants and caterpillar politicians, who feeling veneration for Britain would deliberately set down as "designing traitors," those who for many a long year have spent their time, their talents, and their means, in Britain's service, and who now only pant for the introduction of Bri-

tish principles and British practice—for the Constitution, the whole Constitution, and nothing but the Constitution.

Remember, Oh my Friends, the Laws, the rights, The generous plan of Power delivered down, From age to age: by your renowned forefathers; So dearly bought the price of so much blood; Oh let it never perish in your hands; But piously transmit it to your children. Do thou great liberty inspire our souls, And make our lives in thy possession happy, Or our deaths glorious, in thy just defence.

OGLE R. GOWAN.

Brockville, Upper Canada, }
22d August, 1839. }

Since the foregoing admirable letter was in type a report has been industriously circulated, that its author, Col. Gowan, has abandoned the views so ably advocated therein. To prevent all misunderstanding on this subject we have thought it advisable to append the resolution adopted by the Orangemen of the County of York, together with the garbled version of it, published in the Demi-official *Patriot*, convinced, that our readers of all shades of politics, will join in condemning the scandalous conduct of our cotemporary in thus misrepresenting the sentiments of Col. Gowan. The Resolution before us, and likewise those afterwards adopted by the Orangemen of Simcoe, condemn in the most unequivocal manner, all opinions "repugnant to the principles of our glorious Constitution,"—they express the most decided opposition to any party or persons desirous of overturning that Constitution or destroying our connection with the British Empire. So far from objecting to them on this ground they have our hearty concurrence. It is to be inferred, from the wording of the resolution, that the Earl of Durham has advocated in his Report, principles repugnant to the British Constitution, and we therefore think it right to declare our entire disbelief that such principles are inculcated and to express our regret that they were not distinctly pointed out. The strictly Constitutional principle of Responsible Government,—the principle contended for by the heroes of the Revolution of 1688,—cannot be referred to, because 1st. Col. Gowan, the mover of the resolution before us is its avowed advocate. 2nd. The Grand Orange Lodge has unanimously declared in its favour. 3rd. The first resolution adopted at Simcoe clearly leaves Responsible Government as "an open question" and admits that loyal men may differ as to the expediency of it. 4th. The Simcoe meeting unanimously concurred in a vote of confidence to Col. Gowan with the full knowledge of his determination to advocate that

principle. With Lord Durham's English politics, we, Canadians, have nothing to do. We are contending, be it always understood, for the principles of the Revolution of 1688,—for British Constitutional liberty as distinguished from the government of a "Faction." The Orangemen of Simcoe have expressed their determination not to let their institution be perverted into a cabal for the support of a Faction. Let them bear in mind that the dominant faction of this Province have only existed heretofore by exciting the enmity of Orangemen against their equally loyal fellow-subjects, on the ground that the latter are seeking to subvert the Constitution. The Constitution is in no danger whatever, and will be on a much more secure basis when its real enemies cease to be the irresponsible advisers of the Crown. With these few observations we copy the resolution moved by Col. Gowan.—ED. EXAMINER.

As published in the Patriot.

Resolved,—That we entirely ESCHIEW, CONDEMN, and REPUDIATE every DOCTRINE, OPINION, and SENTIMENT, UTTERED, EXPRESSED or WRITTEN, by the right Honorable the Earl of DURHAM, in His Lordship's REPORT on the state of these Provinces.

That we equally REPUDIATE the Government of any faction in the Colony but are DETERMINED to RESIST the SWAY of RADICALS, who seek in any manner to impair our INSTITUTIONS or WITHDRAW from the ESSENCE and PRINCIPLES of the BRITISH Constitution.

As proposed by Col. Gowan.

Resolved,—That we entirely eschew, condemn, and repudiate every doctrine, opinion and sentiment, expressed or written, by the Right Hon. the Earl of Durham in His Lordship's Report, on the state of these Provinces so far as the said Report in any way upholds or advocates elective institutions, or any species of democratic notions, repugnant to the principles of our Glorious Constitution—a Constitution which, under all circumstances we are resolved to maintain—that we equally repudiate the Government of any faction in the Colony but are determined to resist the sway of radicals who seek in any manner or under any guise to impair our venerable institution, or withdraw from the essence of the British Constitution.

practice—for
Constitution
tution. A
aws, the rights
vered down,
ed forefathers;
much blood
nds;
children.
sols,
sion happy,
st defence.
GOWAN.

English politics,
We are con-
r the principles
ritish Constitu-
the government
of Simcoe have
let their insti-
the support of
that the domi-
e only existed
of Orangemen
bjects, on the
to subvert the
in no danger
re secure basis
e irresponsible
few observati-
y Col. Gowan.

posed by Col.
Gowan.

—That we en-
w, condemn, and
every doctrine,
sentiment, ex-
written, by the
the Earl of Dur-
Lordship's Re-
state of these
o far as the said
any way up-
advocates elec-
tions, or any
emocratic noti-
ant to the prin-
Glorious Con-
Constitution
r all circum-
are resolved to
at we equally
e Government
in the Colony
mised to resist
radicals who
anner or under
mpair our ves-
tition, or with-
e essence of the
stitution.